FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
RIVER AND PLATEAU COMMITTEE MEETING
September 14, 2005
Richland, WA

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Welcome and Introductions 1
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB) 1
Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP) 3
Central Plateau Work Group 5
K Basins Sludge 7
Reactors Along the River 7
Risk Assessments 8
Comprehensive Environmental Responsibility and Liability Act (CERCLA) 5-year Review 10
Treatability Testing at 100-NR-02 11
River Corridor Contract 11
Committee Business 13
Handouts 13
Attendees 13

This is only a summary of issues and actions in this meeting. It may not represent the fullness of ideas discussed or opinions given, and should not be used as a substitute for actual public involvement or public comment on any particular topic unless specifically identified as such.

Welcome and Introductions

Maynard Plahuta, Chair of the River and Plateau Committee (RAP), welcomed the committee and introductions were made. The June meeting summary was adopted with no changes.

Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB)

Dave Grover, Bob Quirk, and Bill Linzau of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB) presented their perspectives on the areas of responsibility for Hanford cleanup. They noted that nothing they said reflects an official perspective of the Defense Board, but rather their own perspectives of the site, and asked that the information shared be treated as such.

DNFSB recently focused on Recommendation 941, getting plutonium into safe storage at the Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP). This project was successfully completed and now the DNFSB is evaluating integrated safety management. There are some weaknesses in the maintenance of nuclear safety that DNFSB is addressing, such as unknown conditions which need to be analyzed more thoroughly before work continues. The nature of work provides for low probability but high-risk accidents, and over time, workers have stopped

thinking critically about the hazards, approaching the risks with a computer program and a checklist mentality. Changes are being made though, and DNFSB is satisfied with the progress. Other critical issues include conduct of operations (con-ops) related work, fire protection, and an activity level that protects the public as well as the workers.

Committee Discussion

- Dick Smith asked about the charter of the board and its authority to implement requests. Dave directed him to www.dnfsb.gov, which provides links on implementation of Department of Energy (DOE) orders and standards and the legislation that provides for their presence. In looking at action on the site, they conduct reviews and report to the board; their weekly reports are posted on the web. They serve as a second set of eyes for DOE.

- Dick asked a question about DNFSB's role in the upgrade of fireproofing standards at the PFP. DNFSB noticed that certain fireproofing requirements were not being met and simply asked DOE to follow the requirements.

- Vince Panesko asked about ventilation at the PFP. Because decontamination and decommissioning (D&D) is going on throughout the building, people are working with the mentality to tear down to the concrete level, but some vital systems need repair since DOE is going to store plutonium in the vault. Dave said he hadn't looked at ventilation. DOE is finishing a study of vital safety systems and will explore this issue. Until all plutonium is gone, the plant will maintain the safety system, and DNFSB has oversight on DOE's monitoring on the safety system.
- Dave Watrous asked if the DNFSB interacted with the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) agencies or the Department of Health. Dave Grover said the TPA was beyond their scope, but they do interact with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Bill Linzau speaks with the people overseeing the tank farms and the Waste Treatment Plant (WTP), but the DNFSB is monitoring safety, not performance to the agreement.
- Greg deBruler asked about process with the DNFSB's 1994 work in the vadose zone. Dave said they haven't had a major effort in that area for awhile. Vadose zone is an environmental remediation issue that DNFSB does not cover. The possibility of waste in the trenches is monitored by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC). Greg asked for clarification of DNFSB's role on the river corridor. Dave said the group's focus was taking the facilities down, the higher risk facilities (324, 327) being the foremost concern. The cocooning of reactors is the next step, and radiological facilities are a lower level of concern.
- Pam Larsen mentioned that she received a weekly report in the mail several years ago; does DNFSB still mail reports? Dave said they still complete a weekly report that is posted on their website and on a DOE website: www.deprep.org. He warned that there is about a month's delay between the writing and posting of reports as DOE does classification reviews before reports are released publicly.

Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP)

Craig Richins, DOE-Richland Operations (RL), is the project director of the PFP. He reported that there had been a lot of activity in the past year; his project has been very busy and very successful due to the great people working there. The project is at a point of transition due to the change in schedule; the plant will have to maintain the plutonium longer than originally planned.

The project's scope includes providing safe and secure storage for special nuclear material (SNM), deactivating and dismantling PFP systems and structures, eliminating all significant hazards to workers, the public and the environment, and minimizing long-term surveillance and maintenance requirements.

Craig reported on progress to date, which includes the completion of the repackaging of all 358 of the 3013 outer containers after turning residues of plutonium into oxide so they were stable. Disposition of miscellaneous nuclear material, such as reactor fuels and slightly irradiated materials, is 53% complete. Uranium was shipped to Oak Ridge. The interim storage casks (ISCs) were sent to the Fast Flux Test Facility (FFTF). 93 of the 9975 containers (used to move the 3013 cans) are packaged and ready to ship; shipping has been held up due to complications at the Savannah River site. The project also completed chemical mitigation activities.

DOE completed initial entry into the highly contaminated 242-Z Americium extraction facility (the McClusky Room). This entry represented the first entry in 17 years. The team entered anticipating residue from the original explosion, but was pleasantly surprised by the amount of clean up that was done at the time. The area is safer than thought and they will be able to move rapidly with that project.

Craig said the success of the PFP project is due to his innovative workers. He praised their hard work in building and inventing equipment and conducting the cleanup and removal while maintaining safety standards.

The PFP project is on a strong path forward. In some of the activities, they are months ahead of schedule, and due to strong efforts on the part of DOE and contractors, they were working on an accelerated schedule for completion in 2009, as opposed to the TPA milestone of 2016. However, the PFP project is in a state of transition. Due to other site priorities, some of the funds in this project are being shifted so other targets are met, and work will slow at PFP. The specific amount of slowdown is not fully determined at this point, and the next month will provide a clearer vision of the budget process. The project had planned on shipping to the Savannah River in 2005, thus eliminating many of the specific hazards resident in the PFP, but since they must maintain the materials longer than anticipated, there is a higher cost of security and safety. The budget for 2008 and beyond will also entail slowing at the PFP. During the last baseline process, DOE reported no anticipated changes to the TPA milestones, and they will ensure that any changes that do need to be made to milestones are addressed. Craig summed up by

saying that in the progress advertised in the past would not longer be possible, but that the project milestones would stay within the parameters of the agreement with the state.

Committee Discussion

- Pam asked about the process for building the interim storage facility. Craig said they are retrofitting 241. Rick Jansons asked why that was chosen instead of a new building or an extension. Craig said there were classified security reasons that were not appropriate to discuss in this venue. Standards can be met with 241 and it is in a good position. They will address the issue of contaminated concrete. Dennis Faulk, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), said they are doing the retrofit so that it's not a capital line item.
- Vince asked how long plutonium storage will continue in the present location. Craig said indefinitely. Vince is concerned about the ventilation, because components of the infrastructure have quit and there is little money to replace them. Craig said conceptual design was occurring for decoupling vault system ventilation that will be present within the next three years. The old system is a recognized problem and will be addressed in future planning. Dave Grover said the crew inspectors were reporting on this issue next week. There are currently no deadlines for moving plutonium out of the site.
- Maynard asked if the great crew would be available to other projects during the slowdown process at the PFP. Craig said the workers were young, so they would likely be the first to be laid off. Seniority is key in being transferred somewhere else. Harold Heacock asked if their clearances to work on-site could be protected; Craig said they could not. The project will lose about nine months in training and conducting the clearance process with new workers from local unions.
- Madeleine Brown pointed out that the layoff and retraining of the workforce is just an expensive example of the larger costs that persist if plutonium has to stay onsite. Pam was also concerned about the increased cost for safety and securities of a new facility when the waste will not ultimately stay on site. It's frustrating not to see a state-to-state or national strategy for dealing with the waste.
- Vince asked about the safety of storage. Craig said the oxide converted from other materials was canned and sealed. They monitor pressure and hydrolysis issues with the cans, which are designed to a 50-year storage standard. The cans will also undergo a size reduction process.
- Dennis said the Board should weigh in on this issue and push for the project. The workers were really excited despite doing the most dangerous work, and now spirits are low. The infrastructure at PFP is a legitimate concern. Todd Martin agreed, since DOE wouldn't figure this issue out on a local level. Susan Leckband said that the advice should be worked with the Budget and Contracts Committee. Advice needs to be crafted so that DOE sees the benefit of the project. Maynard agreed: the goal is not to save jobs, but to get the waste off site to save money. Harold, Rick, and Vince would take the lead. Concepts of the advice include acknowledgment of the good

work that has been done, and a desire to continue the forward momentum of the project. Money will be wasted in building 241 and in losing and retraining workers, and the funding should not shift from clean up to security.

- Rick Bond wanted to include something about using another site for the storage facility, because a new hole in the ground was better than an old contaminated hole in the ground. Craig suggested a separate meeting to suggest the security issues that led to the selection of 241 as a storage facility, as he was not prepared to present the reasons. Dennis said he believed DOE was following the only path it had. Craig said they would bring people to the next meeting who could properly and legally explain the reasons for using 241. Ellen Matlin, DOE-RL, said that the 241 facility needs to be cleaned up anyway, so that some of the money for that project was legitimate clean-up money and that work that is being done would be done anyway.

Central Plateau Work Group

Larry Romine, DOE-RL, presented an update on the Central Plateau work group and how they are making waste site decisions. The group is making good progress. The work group was formed to address challenging issues and incorporate changes during a TPA milestone delay effective July 26, 2005 that will last for 120 days.

Waste site model groups were developed from the 880 waste sites on the Central Plateau; a little over half of those sites (492 sites) will require a modified path to move forward. Of these 492 sites, 379 sites will require a fairly straightforward decision process to continue, while 113 will need to be further developed.

Regulator Perspectives

- Dennis Faulk, EPA, said that this process was being done based on advice to better characterize sites before decisions were made. DOE is doing a select number and using an analogous site approach. This process is based on comments that it is hard to make decisions without analytical data, so data gaps are being identified. His assumption is that more data will be needed on some of the groups, which may lead to changing some milestones. A change package could be sent out to the public as a result of this process. Over the next couple of months, the number of sites that need more information will be nailed down.
- John Price, Ecology, said that the complaint, "you don't have enough characterization," has been heard for years. To DOE's credit, they are getting the data. It is good news that 379 of the waste sites are fairly straightforward.

Committee Discussion

- Dick asked if he could assume everything in the U-area was satisfactory. Larry said the record of decision (ROD) was currently being crafted and will be released in a month or two.

- Greg asked for a list of sites for which DOE decided to use monitored natural attenuation (MNA) as well as any decision documents that got them to that point. Larry said the sites are still only proposed sites and more work must be completed. Dennis said that it's a process of getting waste sites into the database to complete exercises where DOE can look at facilities and data. It may turn out that no action needs to happen, but they will collect data to show there is no risk. They will present this process to the committee at some point. Larry said they have been conservative with identifying the potential waste sites so that some of the work may be as easy as analyzing a paint can and throwing it away.
- Todd said it seemed that DOE was doing a significant amount of work that may bring about a change package. Does DOE run the risk of going too far down the road without allowing the Board to comment on the sites? Particularly if there might be a change package involved, will DOE be at a point where they will be able to hear comment? What is the public involvement in this process? Dennis said that this meeting represented a chance for public involvement, and that official public involvement will occur when the change package is sent out; Dennis is assuming a change package for M 13 and M 15 will be needed.
- Susan said she was involved with this validation at Fluor and that she thought it was a good, inclusive process. She suggested an educational discussion so the committee can better understand the genesis of the process in order to be helpful in determining policy issues. Dennis said he was not positive that there was value in the Board delving into the process, because he is looking at waste sites individually to determine data. Todd said there needed to be substantive check-ins in case there was a blind spot; Dennis said he envisioned using RAP for this.
- Gerry said it sounded like the Board advice on the U-area waste sites was rejected, and he wanted to know if there was a plan for issuing comment on the principles for its rejection. John Price, Ecology, said the plan had not been rejected; Ecology has not responded to it yet. The ROD is required to have a response summary to the advice the Board submitted. Gerry said that if a ROD was issued at all, then the advice had been rejected, since the advice said to re-issue the Proposed Plan, and that it was not good public involvement to do so without a discussion. Gerry urged that Ecology say that they were not going to issue a ROD but rather discuss it with meaningful public involvement. John said the response was not finalized and it would include a whole set of comments, with board advice representing one of those pieces. A specific response to Board advice cannot be made because it would give the Board inappropriate precedence over something such as tribal comments. Gerry again pushed for a public dialogue before a decision was made; as a regulator, Ecology owes that discussion to the board.
- Todd announced that a response to the U-area waste sites advice had been received from DOE. Members of the committee again asked Ecology for a commitment to discuss the plan before issuing a ROD. John wanted to check with an attorney before agreeing to discuss the responsiveness summary with the committee, but he did admit that the responsiveness summary could change the status of the ROD. The committee asked the issue managers to review the response letter and come back to the committee.

K Basins Sludge

Paul Pak, DOE-RL, provided an update on the progress of sludge removal at the K Basins. While the project has worked under good safety of operations and 99% of the fuel has been retrieved, the sludge work is not going well.

The project includes containerizing the sludge in K East Basin and transferring it to K West Basin, which will move K East closer to D&D and then remediation. Then the K West sludge will be containerized and transferred to the Cold Vacuum Drying Facility (CVDF), where the sludge will be treated. The project in K East is behind because they encountered some immobile sludge; the schedule was based on limited experience with sludge that hindered accurate expectations. 82% of K East sludge has been containerized. There will be a better process in K West now that they have learned how to effectively break down the crusted sludge. They are nine months behind the original baseline; Paul guessed they might be finished with containerization at K East by March. K West will be done later. There are also challenges with water quality that will incur additional costs and time.

There is a system optimization study currently in progress about how to treat the sludge. Some sort of oxidation has been proposed that won't create hydrogen. It has been proposed to cook the sludge, dry out all the hydrogen to eliminate flammability to create a more stable uranium oxide that can be stored.

Committee Discussion

- Harold asked for a final estimation on cost. Paul said the original estimate was $58 million in FY 2006, $60 million in FY 2007, $70 million in FY 2008, but that the final numbers will be more than that. Pam asked if there would be any impacts to his budget from cuts. Paul said this project is a number one priority, and as such, he is fully funded.
- Dick said that even if the project had been more successful in dealing with the sludge, the project would be behind since there's not a facility to treat the sludge. Paul said that was the reason for doing K East first. The project can move into D & D on that side more quickly. K East is being done before K West due to significant leakage in K East.
- Shelley asked if there were potential problems with the chemical consistency of sludge in the process to stabilization. Paul said that any process has its pros and cons; DOE is taking another look at the technology that they have chosen to implement. The main issue is oxidizing in a corrosion vessel.

Reactors Along the River

Because the scheduled speaker was not present, Dennis Faulk, EPA, reported on the decision process for reactor cores and provided status on the reactor cocooning project.

DOE was trying to move forward to finish the BC reactor with a final decision and a ROD. When the river corridor risk assessment was made, that was no longer the plan, but reactor cores became part of the decision. DOE delivered an engineering report, which Dennis has reviewed. In light of comments heard at the end state workshops, the cores will sit awhile longer. The expectation is that something will be done with the reactors before clean-up is done; it's possible nothing will happen until 2024.

In 2016, milestones could be determined; with a couple of years per reactor, that is adequate to meet the 2024 deadline. The process will have to be completed during active clean-up. The document will be on the website. Dennis said the ripeness of that document is not present now, but will be in a few years.

The cocooning project is starting in the N Reactor. Five reactors will be done at the end of this year. The B Reactor might be a museum and is scheduled to be done at the last possible moment in the scope.

Committee Discussion

- Maynard asked about the pipes in the river. Dennis said that project is separate and will be addressed when they do the ROD.
- Al Boldt pointed out to the committee that the State of New York set a precedent by convincing DOE to dissemble a reactor with a sizable graphite core. Dennis pointed out another example in Idaho, where they took the reactor apart and got the components out. The previous DOE preference was one-piece removal and people are unsure about using that approach now. In waiting another ten years, another two half-lives of cobalt will have passed. The engineering evaluation on this process is on the website; Todd Nelson will put a listserv out with the link.
- Madeleine asked if there will be unfinished National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) business because they are walking away from the preferred alternative. Dennis said that it was not at that point yet; they are providing safe storage for 75 years, and if they do walk away they will do a supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).
- Dick asked about the depth of the engineering analysis. Dennis said the analysis doesn't say much, but it doesn't need to, as the timing is not right.

Risk Assessments

John Morse, DOE-RL was present to provide the status on risk assessments and how they are being coordinated on-site. Risk assessment coordination and integration is happening in an open, flexible, and collaborative forum. They will put a website up to provide open access to the information, even though some of the information is on other sites already. The forum is trying to implement the Natural Resource Council's recommendations to have an open forum on key topics and issues related to risk-informed decision making.

The forum will identify critical integration issues that must be addressed to support decision making, ensure broad technical participation in issue resolution activities, and periodically review progress and update priorities.

John provided the example of the 100/300 Area to show the progress made in the field of risk assessment. In October 2004, risk integration was identified as a critical need by regulators and stakeholders. DOE provided a status of Hanford Site Risk Assessments in May 2005. The forum has helped to facilitate meetings and workshops to obtain comments and discuss issues related to the DOE document. Agendas for future actions are still being developed.

The next topics that will be tackled are cumulative and composite analyses, risk assessment schedule alignments, and risk assessment technical assumptions.

The committee was informed about a meeting on September 20th at the Tower Inn that would present data that university groups pulled together on segments of the river.

Regulator Perspectives

- John Price, Ecology, said this effort grew out of resource trustees at Hanford who kept commenting that risks were not being assessed and then fit together in an orderly manner. This process shows that progress is being made toward covering everything in an integrated fashion.
- Dennis Faulk, EPA, said that groundwater vadose zone integration never came together until recently, when all the people were together in one room. During that first time in the room together, they were able to commit to working together to gather the data needed to answer these questions.

Committee Discussion

- Gerry wanted to know what exposure scenarios were being included in risk assessments, particularly regarding exposure on children. John said a full suite of exposure scenarios was required by Comprehensive Environmental Responsibility Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) guidance. Larry said the 100/300 Area has a variety of scenarios, including a residential scenario. Gerry said that not all projects had looked at exposure scenarios.
- Greg asked how projects with different parameters would be integrated to look at cumulative risks along the corridor. Larry said risk assessment was being evaluated in the 100/300 Area and would then be applied to the whole corridor. John Stanfill and Greg were named issue managers that would attend the risk assessment meetings and report to the committee.

Todd took a minute to inform the committee about a letter received from Keith Klein, DOE-RL, to Nick Ceto, EPA, that shows significant disagreement about the path forward on BC cribs. EPA does not agree with DOE's preferred remedy.

Comprehensive Environmental Responsibility and Liability Act (CERCLA) 5-year Review

Bryant Charboneau, DOE-RL, discussed the process and timeline for the review. The last 5-year review was done 4½ years ago with EPA taking the lead; at that time, regulations for doing a review were just being drafted. Since then, the EPA has issued guidance and DOE has developed internal regulations.

The scope of the review will include all CERCLA activities regardless of where they are in the process. Some of these activities may only have monitoring occurring. DOE and contractors are gathering the background data and will meet at the end of September. From there, it will take 30 days to create a working document from the data. Technical staff will pull the site data together, create consistency, and send the document back out to the core teams. Currently, a regulator review is scheduled for December.

Stakeholders at the State of the Site meeting in Portland and the Hanford Advisory Board meeting indicated that they wanted more public involvement than just a comment period. The stakeholder comment period will be in February, but there will also be a workshop that corresponds with the public comment period where those who wrote the document will defend their position.

Bryant anticipated the bulk of the report focusing on groundwater, 100/300 remediation, and some 200 waste site remediation. It will be cut and dry on facilities.

Regulator Perspectives

- Alicia Boyd, EPA, said the current schedule was going according to plan although it was somewhat of a hit and miss situation because the site is so split up. Several source operable units haven't checked in, but they will get the data up to date in the next few weeks.
- John Price, Ecology, said that Ecology will emphasize groundwater actions in the 5-year review. Ecology follows six systems and monitors one through EPA. Those actions will probably be holding actions, so they expect the review to have clear action items toward finishing clean-up. The outlines for these systems are good; they just need more detail.

Committee Discussion

- Greg said there has been increasing discussion in the Public Involvement Committee about the need for more communication about what's happening on-site. They want to use the 5-year review as a point to create more holistic dialogue. He proposed a workshop about the 5-year review where there could be a substantive discussion of issues of the past and the upcoming 5-year review to ensure the issues the committee wants addressed are addressed. Greg thought he could get about 8-15 people to attend such a discussion. The committee discussed the need for such a meeting and it was decided that a group of issue manager would have a conference call to set the agenda for a meeting.

Treatability Testing at 100-NR-02

Mike Thompson, DOE-RL, presented the Proposed Plan for treatability testing at 100-NR-02. He gave the committee notice of a half-day session occurring on October 13 that will detail plans on alternative technologies to deal with the plume at 100N.

Under the current ROD, DOE is required to assess alternative technologies to pump and treat (P&T), and they are looking at several technologies. The conclusion is that sequestration technologies appear to hold the best promise for reducing Stronium-90 concentrations at the river. This process involves the injection of calcium phosphate into the soil, which forms apatite, a mineral that's also in teeth. Stronium-90 forms within that mineral and is held there, so that it can decay. The half-life is about 29 years.

The process involves a two-phased approach. The first phase is to use sequestration in highest concentration zone along the shoreline, and then continue evaluation of phytoremediation in conjunction with sequestration as "polishing" in conjunction with a barrier. The plume will not affect the river.

Apatite does not pose any risk to the river but serious back-flushing should be avoided. A field apatite infiltration test will be conducted in March, 2006 to evaluate the mobility of the stronium and field hydrolics.

Regulator Perspectives

- John Price, Ecology, said that it has been four and a half years since the technology workshop on the 100 Area, and it was nice to see progress being made. While DOE is complaining about the cost, it was encouraging to see a move forward because this process represents a real alternative.

Committee Discussion

- Maynard asked if there was adequate funding for this project. Mike said the 2006 budget was not finalized and would be subject to change due to Hurricane Katrina. They do have adequate funding under the current budget.
- Al asked if apatite had any potential uses for uranium. Mike said potentially, as apatite works because it thinks it's calcium.

River Corridor Contract

The discussion on the River Corridor Contract was held as a joint session with the Budget and Contracts Committee.

Kevin Basil, DOE-RL, interim project director for the River Corridor, provided background on the project. The contract was awarded back in March, and ran for two weeks until there was a protest. On June 6, the protest was withdrawn and the transition recommenced. There have been no major issues. The scope of work will be finished in the next month with Bechtel and Fluor. Right now, they have a scope of work set up with

Washington Closure Hanford (WCH) through September 30, 2015, and they are aiming to finish early.

Mike Fox, Director of Project Integration at Washington Closure Hanford, provided an overview of the company and talked about the scope of work on the new contract. Washington Closure Hanford is a limited liability company formed by three major corporations: Bechtel, Washington Group International, and CH2M Hill. All three companies have a good history of performing work safely. Mike explained the organizational framework of an integrated team. The support teams help the work get done, and the group is motivated by working under the one banner of Washington Closure Hanford.

Field work in the contract includes D4 Closure, reactor interim safe storage, field remediation closure, waste operations into the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility (ERDF), and end state and final closure. The support teams are in place. Under the contract, 60% of the work will be subcontracted, and 50% of the subcontracted work will be given to small business. This contract will lead to stable and increased funding for the duration of the project, so that all work will be done on September 30, 2012, ahead of the request for proposal (RFP) deadline. In the long-term view of budgeting for the work, there are penalties on the DOE side for not providing funding; if that occurs, WCH will make a Request for Equitable Adjustment. The funding profile ranges from $183 million in FY 2006 to $386.7 million in FY 2012.

Regulator Perspectives

- Dennis Faulk, EPA, said that the River Corridor Contract was an interesting contract in concept and well set in baselines. The work scope will be negotiated in the 300 Area, so that it is balanced with other DOE work. EPA has remobilized its lab capabilities and will be taking more splits with this contract. The people involved haven't changed, though, so Dennis expects smooth sailing and definition of scope in the 300 Area.
- Rick Bond, Ecology, is encouraged by the contract. If they are supposed to be done by 2012, this work will happen quickly, and the accelerated dates are promising.

Committee Discussion

- Gerry asked if the profile was based on finishing in 2012 or 2015. Kevin said the requested funding profile was for 2015, so when they were give a proposal that went to 2012, the extra could be used in out years if needed.
- Gerry asked about how equitable adjustment would work. Kevin said the relief would be on the schedule side; if there is not enough money, the contractor can ask for relief on the schedule date.
- Gerry asked what the transition is costing in 2006 for the incoming and outgoing contractors, including moving costs. That information was not available, but it will be sent to the committee.

- Gerry asked how prioritization of work would be decided. Kevin said the TPA milestones set the priority, unless the contractors can prove to the regulators that there is a better way to do things. Gerry asked about how incentives are paid out so that contractors are not grabbing at "low-hanging fruit." Kevin said the fees are provisional during the process and will be paid at the end.
- Harold asked how the delay in the K Basins would compromise the schedule. Kevin said relief would likely be requested and they would go through the process of equitable adjustment.
- Gerry asked about the efforts to prevent exposure to beryllium in the 300 Area. He discussed various contractors' rules. Kevin and Mike are concerned with zero exposure to beryllium and will clarify this further for the committee at a later date.

Committee Business

Shelley Cimon reported she is excited about how the Central Plateau Work Group meetings are going.

The committee discussed future meeting needs, which included work on a groundwater field day and sessions on the letter they received on the BC cribs, a waste identification tutorial to better understand the criteria for MNA, the impacts of the PFP bump and roll, and a presentation on why 241 will be used as a waste facility for PFP.

Handouts

- K Basins Closure Project – Sludge Project, Paul Pak, September 14, 2005
- Risk Assessment Coordination and Communication, John Morse, DOE-RL, September 14, 2005
- 100-NR-2 Treatability Testing – Overview of Sequestration Proposal, K. Michael Thompson, September 14, 2005
- Washington Closure Hanford – River Corridor Closure Contract, Mike Fox, September 14, 2005

Attendees

HAB Members and Alternates

Allyn Boldt	Pam Larsen	Gerry Pollet
Madeleine Brown	Susan Leckband	Mike Priddy
Shelley Cimon	Todd Martin	Dick Smith
Greg deBruhler	Vince Panesko	John Stanfield
Harold Heacock	Bob Parazin	Eugene Van Liew
Rick Jansons	Maynard Plahuta	Dave Watrous

Others

Steve Chalk, DOE-RL	Rick Bond, Ecology	David Grover, DNFSB
Karen Lutz, DOE-RL	John Price, Ecology	William Linza, DNFSB
Ellen Mattlin, DOE-RL		Robert Quirk, DNFSB

John Morse, DOE-RL	Dennis Faulk, EPA	Molly Edmonds, EnviroIssues
Craig Richins, DOE-RL		Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues
Larry Romine, DOE-RL		Cathy McCague, EnviroIssues
		Lanny Dusek, FH
		Andrea Hopkins, FH
		Rois Piippo, FH
		Tony Umek, FH
		Janice Williams, FH
		Barb Wise, FH
		Annette Cary, TCH